

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 7-11, and 17-26 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 11 are amended and no claims are added or canceled. Each issue raised in the final Office Action mailed January 14, 2009 is addressed hereinafter.

#### **I. SUMMARY OF THE INTERVIEW**

The Examiner is thanked for the in-person interview conducted on Tuesday, March 24, 2009. In the in-person interview, representatives for the Applicants described the invention (according to Claim 1) and discussed the differences between Claim 1 and the cited art. Representatives proposed an amendment to help clarify the differences between Claim 1 and the cited art. The Examiner agreed to examine Claim 1 in light of the new amendment and perform an additional search.

#### **II. SUMMARY OF THE OBJECTION/REJECTIONS**

Claims 1 and 11 are objected to for reciting “said second document,” which lacks antecedent basis. Claims 1 and 11 are amended to correct the error. Removal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 7, 11, 17, and 21-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,401,084 issued to Ortega et al. (“*Ortega*”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,146,358 issued to Gravano et al. (“*Gravano*”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 8 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Ortega*, *Gravano*, and further in view of “Search Term Suggestion Tool” (“*Bookface*”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 9-10 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Ortega, Gravano*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,127,450 issued to Chang et al. (“*Chang*”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

### III. REJECTIONS BASED ON THE CITED ART

Claims 1, 7, 11, 17, and 21-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Ortega* in view of *Gravano*.

#### A. CLAIM 1

Claim 1 recites:

A method for generating a list of candidate alternative spellings, comprising:  
finding, among a plurality of pages, a first page that contains, in a body of the first page, a link that indicates a first spelling that is also contained in a query that was entered by a user, wherein said link links to a second page;  
**comparing the first spelling with the spelling of terms within said second page in order to identify spellings that are similar to, but not exactly the same as, said first spelling;**  
adding, to a list of candidate alternative spellings of said first spelling, all spellings within said second page that are spelled similar to, but not exactly the same as, said first spelling;  
generating a filtered list at least in part by filtering said list of candidate alternative spellings based on a comparison of (a) a first frequency of occurrences of said first spelling in said plurality of pages to (b) a second frequency of occurrences, in said plurality of pages, of a second spelling from said list of candidate alternative spellings; and  
storing said filtered list on a computer-readable storage medium;  
wherein the steps of comparing, adding, and generating are performed by one or more computing devices. (emphasis added)

At least the above-bolded feature of Claim 1 is not taught or suggested by the cited art.

The Final Office Action cites the abstract and various other portions of *Gravano* for allegedly teaching the previous searching step of Claim 1. Claim 1 now recites a comparing step, in place of the searching step, where a first spelling (indicated by a link) is compared with spellings of

terms, within a page to which the link links, to identify spellings that are similar to the first spelling.

*Gravano* fails to teach or suggest this comparing step. Instead, the pertinent portion of *Gravano* teaches determining a translation of terms in a search query by, for example, using a bilingual dictionary. It is conceded that some terms in one language may be spelled similarly to the corresponding terms in another language. For example, “bank” (English) is spelled similarly to “banco” (Spanish). However, *Gravano*’s system doesn’t determine translations of terms by comparing the spellings of terms in one language with the spelling of terms in another language. Such an approach to translation would not make sense, and could lead to potentially embarrassing results.

For example, if a system were to perform “translation” simply by comparing spellings, it would likely translate the English word “embarrassed” into the Spanish word “emberizada”. Such a translation would inevitably lead to awkward situations, turning “embarrassed” people into “pregnant” people. If they weren’t embarrassed enough before such a translation error, you can be sure that they would be after the translation error.

*Ortega* also fails to teach or suggest that the spelling indicated by a link in a first page is compared with the spellings of terms in a second page **to which the link links**. As was explained in detail in the recent Examiner’s Interview, *Ortega* corrects spellings in a completely different way. Specifically, *Ortega* compares non-matching terms (terms that are not found in a correlation table) with terms that are related to matching terms (terms that are found in a correlation table).

Based on the foregoing, *Ortega* and *Gravano* fail to teach or suggest all the features of Claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore patentable over *Ortega* and *Gravano*. Reconsideration and

withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

**B. CLAIM 11**

Claim 11 recites the same features of Claim 1 discussed above that render Claim 1 patentable over *Ortega* and *Gravano*. Therefore, Claim 11 is patentable over *Ortega* and *Gravano* for at least the same reasons given above for Claim 1.

**C. DEPENDENT CLAIMS**

The remaining claims are dependent claims that depend (directly or indirectly) on one of the claims discussed above. Therefore, the remaining claims are patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons given above for the claim upon which it depends.

**IV. CONCLUSION**

For at least the above reasons, the rejections of Claims 1 and 11, as well as all claims dependent therefrom, are unsupportable and should be withdrawn. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on their incorporation of limitations from the Independent claims, as well as additional limitations that distinguish over cited art. Further, the dependent claims introduce additional features that render them patentable over the prior art. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, separate arguments are not provided at this time.

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by e-mail or telephone

if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application. As per MPEP Chapter 5, Applicant acknowledges that Internet communications may not be secure.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

Hickman Palermo Truong & Becker LLP

Dated: March 31, 2009

/DanielDLedesma#57181/

Daniel D. Ledesma

Reg. No. 57,181

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550  
San Jose, California 95110-1083  
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1229  
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076